

The Deployment of Culture

Why Culture

Culture can be thought of as a particular, highly elaborate way of apprehending certain social experiences and sites of power—an apprehension which began to emerge systematically within European nation-states in the early 1800s, and became elaborated with the growth of bourgeois European republics and their empires. Cultural apprehensions eventually ramified globally, as various social formations of modernity worked their way, throughout the current century, into new human situations, through various social media. Culture's prominence, in short, has emerged not merely from theoretical interests and agendas, but through a number of social and political developments related to modernity. Instigations of culture lie in the spread of capitalism, the rise of the nation-state, and the closely associated development of colonialism.

Social changes related to capitalism led to three varieties of cultural experience. First, capitalism's mobilization of labor and other productive resources imbued many workers and entrepreneurs with an ironic detachment from specific employers, industries, investments, and domiciles which no longer bound people to lifetime commitments. At the same time, the mobile family emerged as a newly prominent site of social reproduction and as a frame for social reference. Culture was thus, in part, the name accruing to the social practice of apprehending social events, not from the vantage of particular localized institutions, but from a generalized, ironic vantage of mobile people, resources, and possibilities. Second, just as mobility increased, so too did rationalization of social life into distinctive compartments of work and play, leading to an isolable realm of leisure, and the elaboration of social sites and industries devoted to filling leisure moments with entertainment, personal socializing, or travel. Culture came

to refer to the experiences associated with such leisure and entertainment. Indeed as consumption of all types became an increasingly crucial component of many capitalist economies, astonishingly extensive systems of meaning emerged for differentiating consumer commodities and their satisfactions. These systems became not only ubiquitous features of social life, but basic means of producing social and moral distinctions. If cultural sensibility was crucially tied to mobility and to leisure, a third important sense of cultural experience emerged around the variety and fashions of commodities—an ongoing spectacle continually fed by advertising.¹

The European nation state and its apparatuses played an equally important role in the growing importance of culture, since they were polities which defined themselves (in Benedict Anderson's useful and ubiquitous phrase) as "imagined communities," organized to serve wide, generalized publics, and devoted to maintaining political order through legitimizing, invented traditions. Intuition of national publics and traditions—of national culture—became increasingly mandatory for most nations' political subjects with the establishment of unavoidable systems of education, social work, and public health. The proliferation of literacy via education especially helped establish an important constituent of national culture (and of—to quote Anderson again—"print capitalism"). The emergence of topical mass-circulation daily journalism, and later of other nationally exhibited media like radio and magazines, established persistent rituals and practices for the immediate experience of national culture. At the same time, traditional arts became selectively isolable from some previous patronizing institutions (like monarchy and church), more intensively bound to others (wealthy businessmen) and newly associated with emergent ones (national academies, museums, folk festivals, television). Art increasingly emerged as a symptom of national culture and society; and knowledge of art as a basis for privileged social commentary. In both senses, art joined literacy, and national systems of journalism, law, education, and public and mental health, as a patron of experiences or capacities which would primarily be labeled cultural.²

Colonization and related population movements—associated with both the growth of capital and the nation state—similarly contributed to the development of cultural apprehensions. Politically or economically motivated migrations led to self-conscious incorporation of migrant "Others" and their divergent ethnicity into metropolitan societies, either through the immigrants' choice or through coercion. Canons of deviance, transgression, and regulation used to support nationalism and colonization led to the institutionalization of widely diffused cultural codes for making highly consequential racial and sexual discriminations.³

The apprehension of culture, then, is linked not only (in the first instance) to a succession of ideas and objects of inquiry that are viable within the academy, but also (in the final instance) to continuing historical

reforms of everyday life related to the spread of capitalism, the nation-state, and colonialism. Yet despite its relationship to very definite social events, culture—like history and society—is not so much a singular concept as a premise for inquiry which can render a wide variety of events into the topic of particular kinds of discussion. Indeed, the notion of culture has served not only as means of articulating sensibilities related to modern subjectivities, but also in a Foucaultian sense, as a powerful principle for the production of disciplinary knowledge about modernized subjects. In both guises, culture has supported a profligate discourse which has historically entailed divergent, even contradictory doctrines. A short list includes evolutionism, folklore, nationalism, collective representation, Orientalism, ritual, totemism, presentation, habitus, mass society, ideology, semiology, hegemony, structuralism, cultural practice, discourse, postmodernism, multiculturalism, postcolonialism, performance theory, critical pedagogy, cultural history.

Each of these took a prominent place within controversies endemic to the politics and social transformations of the modernizing West. To offer a minimal statement of such entanglements: Evolutionism was evidently tied to colonization and racism (Langness). Folklore was tied to the naturalization of “nations” (Williams, *Marxism and Literature*). Scrutiny of collective representation and ideology was tied to destabilizations of class and habitus accompanying the installation of republican democracies (Hobsbawm and Ranger) and capitalist economies (Berman). Semiotics espoused a modernist, relativizing conception of meaning which surmised an extended system of mutually defining signs continually subject to disruption by transformation or addition of terms (Sahlins). Attention to ritual and totems sought to revisit and explain forms of “primitive” experience presumably demystified in the modern West (Durkheim, Lévi Strauss). Debate over mass culture lamented the secularism and consequent banality of “modern” primitives (Ortega y Gasset, Adorno and Horkheimer). Structuralism, in its Lévi-Straussian form, offered a totalizing scheme for dehistoricizing and categorizing the bulk of humanity occupying a post-World War II, decolonizing globe. In its Althusserian form, structuralism sought to render political apparatuses and as ominously total institutions—and (paradoxically) into sites of enduring resistance of the kind discussed by Hall and Jefferson.

Semiotics, Durkheimian thought, and structuralism were accompanied by other, more fundamentally historical and programmatically political theories of culture. Gramsci’s *Prison Notebooks* depicted a West in which capitalism serves not only as an economic system, but as a basis of common sense, transforming everyday meanings and deeds into media for political coalition and direction. Doctrines of discourse and of multiculturalism, and extensions of Freire’s pedagogy of the oppressed, furthered this politicization of the everyday, placing sovereignty over

identity, subjectivity, and knowledge (of oneself as well as of others) at the focus of heated debate. Said's influential description of Orientalism and the subsequent development of postcolonial criticism by Ahmad, Bhabha, and others, made the redress of racism and imperialism into central intellectual programs, furthering a decentering of Western vantages acutely felt in other arenas after the early-1970s oil crisis, and through the increasing assertion of globalizing economies.⁴

Recently expressed doubts over culture's viability as a theoretical construct, then, seem premature, since culture is a phenomenon whose past developments and future directions lie only partially within the academy. Indeed, it is hard to question the ongoing, unavoidable importance of culture as a site of public discourse over crucial social experiences and relationships. Any proposition of the end of culture would ultimately have to be taken as a kind of scholastic word play, like Francis Fukuyama's 1989 suggestion that we had reached the end of history. Few involved in the ongoing production of culture would be very likely to listen—not propagandists for Sri Lankan Buddhist Socialism, nor gay activists, nor Disney Studios, nor television viewers, nor churchgoers.

Rather than suggesting that culture no longer serves as a viable locus of analysis, commentators on the current fate of cultural studies seem to be voicing much more specific concerns, often internal to the academy and its contemporary expectations of cultural theory. These concerns deserve address. The academy, after all, has a long and influential relationship with culture. It trains artists, writers, philosophers, and other producers of culture; equips different cultural laities with varyingly appropriate levels of competence and expertise; offers a site for proselytization and commentary on cultural developments; and extends various credentials authorizing certain kinds of cultural legitimacy. Though the fate of culture does not lie exclusively within the academy, the academy nevertheless provides a well-entrenched, constantly productive, cumulatively effective source for raising agendas about cultural experience and analysis. In the following comments I identify some worries which focus closely on the trajectory of cultural studies in the academy. That discussion broadens into a slightly more general, but inevitably personal, view of cultural study and its changes due to extra-academic pressures. My comments end with a proposition for conducting cultural study in the current environment of poststructuralist, postmodern theory.

Marxist Cultural Studies in Crisis

Recent critics seem, specifically, to be delving for ways to re-energize conceptions of culture for a current generation of academic audiences well versed in an early cohort of proudly cultural research from the late 1950s

and early 1960s, work which was extensively elaborated in the 1970s, and increasingly critiqued throughout the 1980s. Finally, twenty five years of cultural research were rendered into an ossified, readily identifiable target by influential early-1990s anthologies which effectively canonized Cultural Studies.⁵ One clearly voiced set of concerns came from emphasizing the lineage of British Cultural Studies, as it was famously embodied by the Birmingham Centre for Cultural Studies and, less famously, by related groups involved in various forms of activism and adult education. This model of cultural study—featuring its now-familiar, sophisticated mix of semiotics, Althusser, Gramsci, and Bakhtin—initially conceived academic study of culture as a direct and critical response to contemporary political conditions in Britain, offering the knowledge it produced as a kind of political intervention and reorientation for students. James Curran aptly summarizes the sense of British Marxist academics that subsequent cultural studies—particularly in America—have essentially revised the theoretical tools developed by early 1970s British Marxists into elaborate celebrations of the liberal pluralism of contemporary consumer culture.⁶

Charges of revision toward the right seem especially apt in the United States, where highly professionalized, bureaucratized university systems are ambivalent in their criticism of fundamental political institutions; and where cultural study has become a formal, frequently abstruse component of graduate and undergraduate curricula in literature, film, media studies, and. In the U.S., writers like Janice Radway, Henry Giroux, and Lawrence Grossberg have nonetheless insisted that cultural studies can overcome the limiting constraints of the educational apparatus, and carry some valence as a component of a critical, liberatory pedagogy. Inevitably, there is truth to the view that ideas in cultural theory which can seem routine, familiar, and politically defused to knowing researchers and graduate students, still carry substantial powers of interrogation for those coming to them for the first time.

Yet the sense that academic Marxist studies of culture require some kind of renovation should not be attributed only to the co-optation of “Birmingham-style” cultural studies by indefatigably synthesizing American academics. British Marxist thought itself long debated the variety of postures available in forwarding “radical” agendas. In the late 1960s, Britain’s *New Left Review* presented defenses of ivory-tower theorizing in which Western professors emphasized that, as a political program, Marxism in Western Europe had to undertake strategies for success markedly different from the more directly political, decidedly non-academic direction which communist development had taken in the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and China. With the 1992 fall of “actually existing Socialism” in two of those regions, the “soft” Marxism of intellectuals—not just in Britain, but everywhere—was suddenly left as a chief standard bearer of a considerable tradition within the world political imagination

(Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes*). The fall of the Communist bloc presumably affected observers of politics and culture in at least two ways. It furthered the job, already underway among various divergent thinkers—in Baudrillard, in Foucault, in a multitude of feminist critiques (cf. Fraser), in the New Historicism (Veeser)—of undermining the authority of “grand narratives”; for nothing had seemed more institutionalized and immutable in post-World War II politics than the polarization of the world between two camps which established, through one cultural mediation or another, an encompassing dialectic for class conflict. At the same time, the transformation of the former Soviet bloc potentially escalated the sense of capitalism as an inescapable, ineluctable social and ideological program. In some ways capitalism emerged as the only credible fragment of grand narrative left—a loosely hinged narrative best elaborated, paradoxically, in descriptions of postmodernism developed by Marxists David Harvey and Fredric Jameson. It is little wonder that by the early 1990s, some critics were hoping Marxist cultural studies could offer intensified political definition within the “New World Order,” and yet were equally lamenting how theory—now unaccompanied by the imposing political edifices of socialism—seemed insufficient for such a job.

Anthropological Cultural Studies in Self-Defeat

British Cultural Studies was not the only program of cultural investigation suffering from diminished amplitude by the 1980s. Cultural study was equally based in more conservative traditions of bourgeois social science developed within state- or church-related academies closely linked to Western states and their empires. The most dramatic examples lay in French and British social anthropology, which began as attempts to translate the religious experiences and cognitive logic of supposedly primitive Others into Western comprehensions, developed theories on the nature of legitimacy, economics, and political power based on their organization within distinctive institutions of kinship, religious hierarchy, social exchange, and language. The relationships between anthropology and other agencies of colonialism are well documented. Frequently they took the form of explicit military action. Geertz discusses Edward Evan Evans-Pritchard’s temporary induction of his anthropological subjects to serve as English soldiers under his command in the African theater of World War I. Similarly, one of the first ethnographers to examine Mexicans in South Texas was a cavalry officer who, in Limón’s words, practiced anthropology as he practiced war against the same population. At other times anthropology produced less blunt, but equally concerted kinds of colonial intervention. Nicholas Dirks recounts how many inhabitants of a newly unified India had to have the native caste system explained to them before they could repeat its features to British soldiers, who then wrote them

down in order to compile notes on how to administrate locals using their own mores. Durkheimian theoreticians like Dumont would subsequently argue that India represented a culture uniquely and harmoniously sustained by a vast, organic sense of caste hierarchy. By the 1980s, anthropologists rarely served as overt members of national military or police forces, but they persisted as employees within national museums (in the U.S., especially, the notorious Smithsonian Institution); as state folklorists; as consultants to oil companies or other enterprises requiring good relationships with “natives”; or as workers for international non-governmental organizations whose local political agendas were sometimes open to question.⁷

Indeed, by the 1980s, anthropology was forced to reconsider some of its most fundamental assumptions. Its preferred form of knowledge production, the individually authored ethnographic essay, became increasingly suspect as a subjective and ethnocentric enterprise premised on arbitrary exoticization and objectification of others (Marcus and Fischer, Clifford and Marcus). Its attempts to document other ways of life became increasingly regarded, by commentators like Rosaldo, as artificial and ahistorical. Increasingly, intellectual historians of anthropology like James Clifford connected anthropological knowledge to specifically Western cultural enterprises like surrealism or fauvism. In all locales, moreover, anthropologists increasingly encountered embarrassingly familiar accouterments and situations: television viewing, Coke-drinking, sports and music T-shirts. If earlier in the century, culture served as a theoretical construct which the anthropological expert could decipher from the exotic behavior of others, the cultures encountered by the anthropologist later in the century were increasingly familiar to the anthropologist and her presumed home audiences. Little wonder anthropologists sometimes felt cheated when the social groups they sought out weren't different enough, and the description of their cultures became either impossibly arduous or vacuous.

Culture was also increasingly present in the other major site of bourgeois social theory, sociology. By the early 1970s, culture began to emerge as a new and central interest linking heretofore distinct (often Durkheimian) sociological subdisciplines examining religion, deviance, social stratification, sociolinguistics, education, art and media. Much of this work can now be viewed, in varying degrees, as studies in the production of culture. In Europe too, key figures in cultural theory—Jürgen Habermas, Maurice Halbwachs, Basil Bernstein, Mary Douglas, Peter Berger, Pierre Bourdieu, and to a lesser extent Anthony Giddens—worked within the foundations, schools, and grant systems of quite traditional bourgeois sociology (with Douglas and Bourdieu's careers particularly working to blur the distinctions between bourgeois sociology and imperial anthropology).

These influential sociological thinkers were from the start distinct in making few claims for radical political intervention using the cultural knowledge they produced. Even more so than anthropologists, the group listed above was devoted to the production of liberal bourgeois knowledge whose most extreme political edge would take the form of proposed “policy implications.” On the whole their cultural insights emerged as complicating re-discoveries and refining appreciations of bourgeois political communities (Habermas), systems of pollution (Douglas), reputation and fame (Bourdieu) and consumer pleasures (Schudson, *Advertising, the Uneasy Persuasion*). Theirs were fundamentally achievements in techniques of cultural observation, whose drama began to fade as they became routine. The use of such techniques in the mid 1990s could still render important insights, but required careful reframing by the user if they were to be recast as trenchant political interventions on the order of British Cultural Studies.

Culture Re-Energized: Postcolonial Studies and Multiculturalism

With Marxism and, indeed, master narratives, in decline; with anthropological “knowing” in crisis; and with once novel forms of cultural theorizing routinized into institutionalized sociological abstractions, it is not surprising that important changes in cultural study in the early 1990s came, not from within any of these traditions, but from outside sources instead. With them came an important reformulation of culture not simply as an instrument for control, or a vehicle for resistance, but as an active principle for reconceiving individual and collective human rights—a principle as basic as the principle of state power.

With the Second World in marked disarray; with First World capitalism increasingly and more evidently tied to exogenous labor, suppliers, and markets (and crucially redefining the terms of its own sovereignty through the consolidations of the European Community in 1992), Third World (and occasionally “Fourth World”) intellectuals began to assume a concerted role in the formulation of cultural apprehensions—not just for themselves, as they had long done under imperial regimes, but for the First World and its academies as well.⁸ In a profound sense, the influx of Other cultural apprehensions in the early 1990s completed a final uprooting of culture from the European sites and conditions in which it had its origins. It now became inevitable, within the Western academy, to perceive how systematic production and refiguration of culture (conceived as the set of experiences and sites described in the beginning of this essay) was fully incorporated into “independent” politics unregulated by the West: in Revolutionary Iran; in Egyptian religious revivalism; in the stunning fall

of South African apartheid; in the distinctive regional conflicts and diasporas of Indian intellectuals, and of those who, despite various nationalities and domiciles, thought of themselves as being in one way or another Chinese. (These comprise wholly incidental examples which hardly exhaust the available instances.)

Along with post-Cold War, postcolonial apprehensions of globalization, came a consequent academic focus, from the mid 1980s onward, on nationalism, the state, borders, and the uneven penetration of various modernities in different parts of the globe. The Western academy became increasingly attuned to discussions of cultural creolization (Hannerz), cultural hybridization (Canclini), the culture of occupied zones (Lavie), the double consciousness proliferated by international diasporas (Gilroy, Lavie and Swedenburg) and the complicated domesticity established by transnational media addressing redefined family households (Silverstone and Hirsch).

These discussions obviously marked, not a decline, but an elaboration of agendas about culture: they addressed innately cultural issues like the articulation of ideologies, the social circulation of texts, the social stabilization of habitual practices, the construction of subjectivities (especially around race, gender, and class), and the extension of shared and conflicted Imaginaries.

Though apparently innocuous, the divorce of culture from its originating political and social contexts marked important changes in its discourse. Raymond Williams' canonical history of the concept of culture emphasized Herder's use of the term to articulate "folk" identity as the basis for a solidarity which legitimized the nation as more than simply the region governed by a state (Berlin). Now the apprehensions and sites constituting culture went traveling, leaving the European nation state and its imperial hierarchies behind. But culture did not thus become depoliticized; instead it simply established a more mobile field of political activity and experience. Indeed, the figure which seemed to suffer more in the divorce was the nation-state. By the mid 1990s, the postcolonial, globalized, and multiethnic nation, though still central to many varieties of economic and political activity, nevertheless seemed less legitimate and enduring. In the European Community, in NAFTA-era North America, in post-Soviet Eastern Europe, it was arguments for the continuing legitimacy and identity of the nation-state, rather than arguments for its contingency, which seemed to bear an increasingly heavy burden for proof.

Cultural sites and experiences, on the other hand, seemed newly and effectively volatile—even more authoritative in their political valence than they had been in the hands of academics and Western governments. Nowhere was this more evident than in the highly energetic politics of multiculturalism and racial polarization which arose in the U.S. Implicit in

multiculturalism was the sense that cultural identity, ethnic solidarity, and ethnic revitalization—and not (or not only) the individual citizen of bourgeois liberalism—is the true locus of political rights. Political rights should support not just the pursuit of individualized happiness, but the ability to maintain and reproduce particular subjectivities and cultural sensibilities.

This, arguably, was the rationale motivating a white-majority Los Angeles jury to find against Rodney King, an African American-majority Los Angeles jury to find for O.J. Simpson, and an African American-majority Washington D.C. jury to find for Marion Berry. The signal importance of the defendants in each case apparently lay in their roles within ongoing ethnic wars and programs of ethnic defense—concerns which evidently outweighed conventionally conceived issues of individual moral responsibility. The same political battle was being fought out in judicial reviews and popular referenda against affirmative action policies. Equally related was the emergence, within the American legal system, of the “cultural defense,” which argued that a defendant’s (often an immigrant’s) cultural background embodies a moral and practical reason incommensurate with, and unaccountable to, the logic of American law as it is usually applied.

In these senses, argues Terrence Turner, multiculturalism was claiming ethnicity as a more fundamental seat of loyalty, indeed of political sovereignty, than the state. In place of national ideologies, multiculturalism substituted the innately ethical, future-oriented political agendas which are the hallmark of ethnic revitalization movements and of ethnic identification.⁹ In this sense, multiculturalism cannot be regarded as a political development fundamentally different from the ethnic cleansings in Serbia, Kurdish struggles within Iraq, or intrastate tensions in India. I suggest that the example of civil rights struggles in the United States prompts a need for reconsideration of these other struggles, so frequently dismissed, from the vantage of American universities, as anomalous “atrocities” within the usual political order. They clearly mark powerful subversions of taken-for-granted forms of political stability. In each of them, cultural experiences and apprehensions have become fundamental motives and justifications for direct political action.

From this view, then, I find charges that culture is a highly abstract or ungrounded notion somewhat surprising. Instead, I see culture outside the academy as challenging profound assumptions about political legitimacy and social struggle (in ways at least as fundamental as the Western academy’s traditional vantage for social critique, Marxism). One conceivable challenge for students of culture within the American academy, would be to stop looking within the academy for “new” theories to energize cultural inquiry, and instead invoke (and critique) the considerable traditions already available by renovating them to account for this profound and militant shift in the nature of cultural politics itself.

Such renovation will doubtless take unexpected turns, but I would like to suggest one metaphor for elaboration: new attention to culture as the aesthetic, moral, and political disposition of meanings and practices across everyday life.

Focus on disposition is intended to emphasize the tactical, instrumental sense with which people can arrange their cultural apprehensions. This is a view of culture which emphasizes the agency, mobility, and contingency of cultural experience in a postmodern, globalizing world. The equal regard for aesthetics, morals, and politics is meant to emphasize, not the independence of each, but the interchangeable importance, indeed, the interchangeable value, of each, in such a world. Finally, the locus of inquiry in the meanings and practices of everyday life is meant to imply that much of contemporary culture's capacity to produce power lies, not only in museums or academies, but in the control of far more personal and immediate spaces.

Attention to dispositions is, in fact, a strategy of analysis implied by many cultural thinkers working within diverse theoretical frameworks. Disposition carries a sense of military tactical calculation, and so Gramsci can be said to be talking about cultural dispositions as he elaborates his metaphor of wars of position against wars of maneuver. Disposition also carries a sense of meaningful arrangement, and so Bourdieu (both in his discussions of practice and of cultural distinction-making) can be regarded as a theorist of cultural disposition as he talks about fields of cultural meaning and the cultural exchanges they support. Disposition further implies sensible placement, and so Fredric Jameson can be thought to discuss cultural disposition as he forwards his notion of cognitive mapping. Within anthropology and media studies, discussions of transnational migration, diaspora (Lavie and Swedenburg) and of spaces of identity (Morley and Robins), address evident dispositions of bodies and groups in certain places and within particular domiciles. Foucault's panopticon and Bennett's exhibitionary complex exemplify the interwoven aesthetic, moral, and political effects of careful physical and visual disposition by important institutions. In another image of disposition, Michael Taussig writes of the "map of implicit social knowledge" carried by Colombians—a map registering different geographic regions, Indian territories, ethnic groups, colonial hierarchies, paths of pilgrimage, and dark, mental "spaces of death" produced by the Spanish Conquest.

I suggest studying dispositions not as a governing theoretical revision, but, to the contrary, as one means of redeploying the substantial resources of cultural analysis we already have. Cultural study is hardly stalled; its topic is reinventing contemporary politics and everyday life.

Notes

¹ On the role of the family, see Engels, as well as the first chapter of Williams' *Television: Technology and Cultural form*. Bailey, Rosenzweig, May, and McCannell each offer insightful discussions on the emergence of leisure. Sahlin, Haug, and Bourdieu's *Distinction* discuss consumption as a cultural site.

² Hobsbawm details the prominence of the representative republic in *The Age of Extremes*. The role of education and other national apparatuses are detailed by Bourdieu and Passeron, Althusser, and by Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*.. Hobsbawm's introduction to *The Invention of Tradition* details the importance of journalism, mass sport, and public art for sustaining nations.

³ Smith, Takaki, and Chambers each offer distinctive views of the roles of immigration, ethnicity, and urbanization in shaping modernity. Balibar and Wallerstein, Foucault, and Stallybrass and White discuss divergent systems of classification, censure, and transgression linked to modernity.

⁴ Discourse in several senses is presented in quite different ways by Foucault, Lincoln, Terdiman, and Fiske. Goldberg offers a useful anthology of multiculturalism.

⁵ The first generation of British cultural study includes Williams' *Culture and Society*, Hoggart's *Uses of Literacy*, as well as slightly later work by E.P Thompson and Christopher Hill. Work at the Birmingham Centre for Cultural Studies is well tracked by Stuart Hall's articles listed in the bibliography. Wuthnow et al. and Nelson and Grossberg offer a signal discussion of mid 1980s critiques. Three of the most visible 1990s canon makers were Grossberg, Nelson, and Treichler's *Cultural Studies*, Mukerji and Schudson's *Rethinking Popular Culture*, and Simon During's *Cultural Studies Reader*.

⁶ See Hall's article on Birmingham's legacies, and Barker and Beezer on the fate of politicized British cultural studies.

⁷ Among the most useful discussions of anthropology's relationship to colonialism are Stocking's examination of anthropology's role in evolutionism and racism, Fabian's address of the construction of ahistorical Others, Asad's talks about the projection of Western conceptions onto others, and Kuper's critiques of the conception of the "primitive."

⁸ Here I emphasize that the 1990s marked, not the emergence of other cultural sites and experiences (for these had existed across the globe for at least a century and a half), or a sudden efflorescence of non-European thought, but rather a moment for the sudden introduction of both to formerly solipsistic western sites of power.

⁹ Both West and Fischer argue powerfully for ethnicity's status as an ethical and political program for a better future. Both suggest, in quite different ways, that such a program is not incidental, but central, to ethnic identity.

Works Cited

- Abu-Lughod, Janet. "Going Beyond Global Babble." *Culture, Globalization, and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*. Ed. Anthony King. London: Macmillan, 1991. 131-137.
- Adorno, Theodor, and Max Horkheimer. "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception." *The Cultural Studies Reader*. Ed. Simon During. New York: Routledge, 1993. 29-43.
- Ahmad, Aijaz. "Jameson's Rhetoric of Otherness and the 'National Allegory.'" *Social Text*, 17 (1987): 3-25.

- Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." Trans. Ben Brewster. From *"Lenin and Philosophy" and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971. 127-186.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1985.
- Asad, Talal. "The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology." *Anthropology as cultural critique*. Ed. George Marcus and Michael Fischer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986. 141-164.
- Bailey, Peter. *Leisure and Class in Victorian England: Rational Recreation and the Contest for Control, 1830-1885*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Balibar, Etienne, and Immanuel Wallerstein. *Race, Nation, and Class: Ambiguous Identities*. Trans. Chris Turner. London: Verso, 1991.
- Barker, Martin, and Anne Beezer, eds. *Reading into Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulations*. Trans. Paul Foss, Paul Patton & Philip Beitchman. New York: Semiotext(e), 1983.
- Becker, Howard. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- Bennett, Tony. *Bond and Beyond: the Political Career of a Popular Hero*. London: Methuen, 1987.
- . "The Exhibitionary Complex." *Culture/Power/History*. Ed. Nicholas Dirks, Geoff Eley and Sherry Ortner. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994. 123-154.
- . "Theories of Media, Theories of Society." *Culture, Society, and the Media*. Ed. Michael Gurevitch, et al. London: Methuen, 1982. 30-55.
- Berger, Peter. *Capitalist Revolution: Fifty Propositions about Prosperity, Equality and Liberty*. New York: Basic Books, 1986.
- Berger, Peter, and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: a Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, 1966.
- Berlin, Isaiah. *Vico and Herder: Two Studies in the History of Ideas*. New York: Viking Press, 1976.
- Berman, Marshall. *All that is Solid Melts into Air: the Experience of Modernity*. New York: Penguin Books, 1988.
- Bernstein, Basil. *Class, codes, and control*. New York: Schocken Books, 1975.
- Bhabha, Homi. *Nation and Narration*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: a Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- . *The logic of practice*. Trans. Richard Nice. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Jean-Claude Passeron. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1990.
- Canclini, Nestor Garc'a. *Hybrid Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.
- Chambers, Ian. *Popular Culture: the Metropolitan Experience*. London: Methuen, 1986.
- Clifford, James. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Clifford, James, and George Marcus, ed. *Writing Culture: the Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
- Curran, James. "The New Revisionism in Mass Communication Research: a Reappraisal." *Cultural studies and communications*. Ed. James Curran, David Morley and Valerie Walkerdine. London: Arnold, 1996. 256-278.

- DiMaggio, Paul. Cultural Boundaries and Structural Change: the Extension of the High Culture Model to Theater, Opera, and the Dance, 1900-1940. *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*. Ed. Michèle Lamont and Marcel Fournier. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992. 21-57.
- . "Market Structure, the Creative Process, and Popular Culture." *Journal of Popular Culture* 11.2 (1977): 436-452.
- Dirks, Nicholas. *The Hollow Crown: Ethnohistory of an Indian Kingdom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Douglas, Mary. *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1986.
- . *Purity and Danger*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.
- . *Risk Perception According to the Social Sciences*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1987.
- Douglas, Mary, and Baron Isherwood. *World of goods*. New York: Basic Books, 1979.
- Dumont, Louis. *Homo Hierarchicus: the Caste System and its Implications*. Trans. Mark Sainsbury. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- During, Simon. *The Cultural Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Durkheim, Emile. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. Trans. Joseph Ward Swain. New York: Free Press, 1965.
- Engels, Frederick. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*. New York: International Publishers, 1972.
- Fabian, Johannes. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Featherstone, Mike. *Undoing Culture: Globalization, Postmodernism, and Identity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1995.
- Fischer, Michael. "Ethnicity and the Post-Modern Arts of Memory." *Writing Culture: the Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Ed. James Clifford and George Marcus. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986. 194-233.
- Fiske, John. *Television Culture*. New York: Methuen, 1987.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.
- . *Discipline and Punish*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Viking Press, 1979.
- . *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Viking Press, 1980.
- Fraser, Nancy. *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse, and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New rev. ed. New York: Continuum, 1993.
- Fukuyama, Francis. The end of history? *The National Interest* (1989): 3-18.
- Gans, Herbert. *Popular Culture and High Culture: an Analysis and Evaluation of Taste*. New York: Basic Books, 1974.
- Geertz, Clifford. *Works and Lives*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.
- Giddens, Anthony. *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- . *The Constitution of Society. Outline of a Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- Giddens, Anthony. *Modernity and Self Identity*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991.

- Gilroy, Paul. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Giroux, Henry. *Disturbing Pleasures: Learning Popular Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Goldberg, David, ed. *Multiculturalism, a Critical Reader*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1994.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Trans. Quintin Hoare & Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971.
- Grossberg, Lawrence, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler, ed. *Cultural studies*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Legitimation Crisis*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1975.
- . *The Theory of Communicative Action. Vol. 1, Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Trans. T. McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1984.
- . *The Theory of Communicative Action. Vol. 2, Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1987.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *The collective memory*. Trans. Francis J. Ditter, Jr., & Vida Yazdi Ditter. Rev. ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1980.
- Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms." *Media, culture and society: a critical reader*. Ed. Richard Collins, et al. London: Open University Press, 1986. 33-48.
- . "Cultural Studies and Its Theoretical Legacies." *Cultural Studies*. Ed. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson and Paula Treichler. New York: Routledge, 1991. 277-286.
- . "Introduction to Media Studies at the Centre." *Culture, Language, Media*. Ed. Stuart Hall, et al. London: Hutchinson & Co., 1981. 117-121.
- . "The Rediscovery of 'Ideology': Return of the Repressed in Media Studies." *Culture, Society, and the Media*. Ed. Michael Gurevitch, et al. London: Methuen, 1982. 56-90.
- Hall, Stuart, and T. Jefferson. *Resistance through Ritual*. London: Hutchinson & Co, 1975.
- Hannerz, Ulf. *Cultural Complexity: Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.
- Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity: an Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.
- Haug, Wolfgang. *Critique of Commodity Aesthetics*. Trans. Robert Bock. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *The Age of Extremes: a History of the World, 1914-1991*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, ed. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Hoggart, Richard. *The Uses of Literacy*. London: Penguin Books, 1958.
- Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Kuper, Adam. *The Invention of Primitive Society: Transformations of an Illusion*. New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hal, 1989.
- Langness, L. *The study of Culture*. 2nd ed. Novato, California: Chandler & Sharp, 1987.
- Lavie, Smadar. *The Poetics of Military Occupation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Lavie, Smadar, and Ted Swedenburg, eds. *Displacement, Diaspora, and Geographies of Identity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996.

- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *Structural Anthropology*, Vol. 1. Trans. Claire Jacobson & Brooke Schoepf. New York: Basic Books, 1963.
- . *Totemism*. Trans. Rodney Needham. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.
- . *Tristes Tropiques*. Trans. John & Doreen Weightman. New York: Atheneum, 1981.
- Lincoln, Bruce. *Discourse and the Construction of Society: Comparative Studies of Myth, Ritual, and Classification*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Marcus, George, and Michael Fischer, eds. *Anthropology as Cultural Critique*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- May, Lary. *Screening out the past: the birth of mass culture and the motion picture industry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- McConnell, Dean. *The tourist: a new theory of the leisure class*. New York: Schocken Books, 1976.
- Morley, David, and Kevin Robins. *Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes and Cultural Boundaries*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Mukerji, Chandra, and Michael Schudson, ed. *Rethinking popular culture: contemporary perspectives in cultural studies*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Ortega y Gasset, José. *The Revolt of the Masses*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1957.
- Peterson, Richard, ed. *The Production of Culture*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976.
- Radway, Janice. "Identifying Ideological seams: Mass Culture, Analytical Method, and Political Practice." *Communication* 9 (1986): 93-123.
- Robertson, Roland. "Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity." *Global Modernities*. Ed. Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson. London: Sage Publications, 1992. 25-44.
- Rosaldo, Renato. *Culture and Truth: the Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1989.
- Rosenzweig, Roy. "The rise of the saloon." *Rethinking popular culture*. Ed. Chandra Mukerji and Michael Schudson. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991. 121-156.
- Sahlins, Marshall. *Culture and Practical Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Viking Press, 1979.
- Schudson, Michael. *Advertising, the Uneasy Persuasion: Its Dubious Impact on American Society*. New York: Basic Books, 1984.
- . *Discovering the News: a Social History of American Newspapers*. New York: Basic Books, 1978.
- Silverstone, Roger, and Eric Hirsch, ed. *Consuming Technologies: Media and Information in Domestic Spaces*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Smith, Anthony. *Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
- Stallybrass, P., and Allon White. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986.
- Stocking, George W. Jr. *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1968.
- Takaki, Ronald. *Iron Cages: Race and Culture in 19th-century America*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1979.
- Taussig, Michael. *Shamanism, Colonialism, and the Wild Man: a Study in Terror and Healing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Terdiman, Richard. *Discourse/Counter-Discourse: the Theory and Practice of Symbolic Resistance in Nineteenth-Century France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Turner, Terence. "Anthropology and Multiculturalism: What is Anthropology that Multiculturalists Should be Mindful of It?" *Cultural Anthropology* 8.4 (1993): 411-429.

- Veesser, Aram, ed. *The New Historicism*. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- West, Cornel. "The New Cultural Politics of Difference." *The cultural studies reader*. Ed. Simon During. New York: Routledge, 1993. 203-220.
- Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- . *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- . *Television: Technology and Cultural Form*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974.